

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The declaration was considered defective since it did not identify the state or residence of the applicant. A new data sheet is submitted herewith providing this information.

The drawings have been objected to because the reference character "22" has been used to designate both belt mounting loops and mating loops. It is respectfully submitted that this is not a drawing error but is merely a typo for "mounting". The error has been corrected in the specification.

The drawings were further objected to because the reference character "34" has been used to designate both an adhesive hydrocolloid skin barrier disk and an adhesive barrier disk. It is respectfully submitted that this is not an error in the drawings but is merely an error in not including the word hydrocolloid in the latter phrase. This has been corrected in the specification.

Claims 11, 15-16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nowak et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nowak et al. does not disclose a mounting disc having first and second foam discs, where a second face of said second foam disc is adhered to a first face of said first disc, as required by independent claims 11 and 16. The examiner relies on foam layer 18 and foam intermediate ring 25 of Nowak et al. as being equivalent to the second and first foam discs, respectively, of the present invention. However, a second face of foam layer 18 is not adhered to a first face of foam intermediate ring 25. Instead, foam layer 18 and foam intermediate ring 25 are separated by support ring 24 and faceplate 12. Moreover, foam layer 18 is located in an ostomy appliance composed of a collection pouch 11 and faceplate 12; while foam intermediate ring 25 is located in a convex pressure ring assembly (see Fig. 4, for example).

Further, Nowak et al. does not disclose an adhesive skin barrier disc having an outer diameter substantially corresponding to the outer diameter of said second foam disc, as recited in independent claims 11 and 16. The examiner relies on microporous patch 17 of Nowak et al. as being equivalent to the adhesive skin barrier disc of the present invention. However, microporous patch 17 has an outer diameter which is substantially larger than the outer diameter of foam layer 18, as illustrated in Fig. 4 of Nowak et al.

Appl. No. 09/758,726
Amdt. dated October 7, 2003
Reply to Office action of May 14, 2003

Because Nowak et al. does not include each and every limitation as set forth in independent claims 11 and 16, it is respectfully submitted that Nowak et al. does not anticipate such claims. Therefore, claims 11 and 16, and all of the claims dependent therefrom, are allowable in view of Nowak et al.

Claims 12-14 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowak et al. as applied to claims 11, 15-16 and 20, and further in view of Leise Jr. et al.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 12-14 and 17-19 depend from independent claims 11 and 16, respectively, which are believed to be allowable over Nowak et al. for at least the reasons cited above. Leise, Jr. et al. does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Nowak et al. Accordingly, the combination of Nowak et al. and Leise Jr. et al. does not make obvious claims 12-14 and 17-19.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33038.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Thomas P. Schiller, Reg. No. 20677

526 Superior Avenue East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

October 7, 2003